

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
AIKEN DIVISION**

Bobby Robbins,)	C/A No. 1:18-2779-CMC
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
Commissioner of Social Security)	OPINION & ORDER
Administration,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff's *pro se* complaint against the Social Security Administration. ECF No. 1. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(a), DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges for pre-trial proceedings.

On October 24, 2018, the Magistrate Judge entered an Order and Notice to Plaintiff, detailing deficiencies in his Complaint and permitting him until November 7, 2018 to file an Amended Complaint. ECF No. 8. The mail was returned as undeliverable on October 31, 2018. ECF No. 10. The envelope was stamped "Return to Sender, Vacant, Unable to Forward." *Id.* On November 2, 2018, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation ("Report") recommending the Complaint be dismissed with prejudice for failure to prosecute. ECF No. 13. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Plaintiff has filed no objections and the time for doing so has expired.¹

¹ The Report has not been returned to the court as undeliverable.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The court reviews the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”) (citation omitted).

After reviewing the record of this matter, the applicable law, and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the court agrees with the conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the court adopts and incorporates the Report and Recommendation by reference in this Order, except that the dismissal shall be without prejudice. This action is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process for failure to prosecute pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE
Senior United States District Judge

Columbia, South Carolina
December 5, 2018